

REMARKS

Applicants thank Examiner Wollschlager for his time and consideration of the present application during the telephonic interview of October 22, 2009 with the undersigned.

During the interview, the present amendment to the claims and the content of the Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 (included in the appendix) were discussed, and compared to the teachings of cited documents ECKBERG and BRALEY.

This application has been amended in a manner to place it in condition for allowance at the time of the next Official Action.

Status of the Claims

Claims 8 and 16 are amended to direct the invention to a mold for making a heat curable composite material, wherein the stripping composition is polymerized by heating. Additionally, the 5 to 10 parts of anti-adhesion modulator is constituted by an epoxy polydimethylsiloxane which is not polymerized, and the anti-stick agent comprises both dodecyl monovinyl ether and cyclohexane dimethanol divinyl ether, each being present in the stripping composition at 8 to 12 parts by weight.

Support for the amendment to claim 8 may be found in claims 9 and 13, and support for the amendment to claim 16 may be found in previously presented claims 17, 21, 22, 26, 30. Further

support may be found in paragraphs [0012] and [0033] of the published application.

Claims 13, 15, 27-29 are amended accordingly.

Claim 34 is new and directed to the stripping composition utilized by, for example, the mold of claim 8, the wipe or cloth of claim 15, and the method of claim 16. The particular features where, for example, recited in the dependent claims. Thus, as the features of the claimed stripping composition were part of originally presented and examined claims, consideration of this claim is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 17, 21-23 25, 26, 30, 32 and 33 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 8, 13-16, 24, 27-29 and 34 remain in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 8 and 16 were objected to for informalities.

These claims have been amended to correct these informalities, and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections-35 USC §112, 1st paragraph

Claims 8, 9, 15-17 and 23-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for not complying with the written

description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons below.

The position of the Official Action was that the specification does not explicitly disclose a general anti-stick agent that is 8-12 parts by weight of the stripping composition. Thus, the independent claims 8 and 13 are amended to recite the anti-stick agent components that are explicitly described in this amount: dodecyl monovinyl ether and cyclohexane dimethanol divinyl ether.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections-35 USC §112, 2nd paragraph

Claims 15 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons below.

Claim 15 has been amended to clarify the wipe or cloth is impregnated with the stripping composition of claim 8, as understood by the Examiner.

Claim 23 is cancelled.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections-35 USC §103

Claims 8, 9, 13-17, 21-25, 29, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ECKBERG et al. US 5,650,453 (ECKBERG '453) in view of BRALEY US 2,811,408 (BRALEY).

Claims 26-28 and 30 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ECKBERG in view of BRALEY, and further in view of ECKBERG US 4,256,870 (ECKBERG '870) and LOPES et al. US 4,681,714 (LOPES).

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over ECKBERG in view of BRALEY, and further in view of DMITROFF US 3,321,019.

These rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons that follow.

The claimed stripping composition is in combination with a mold, method and wipe or cloth for the purpose of preventing adhesion to mold in a molding process for a heat curable composite material. The composition is solvent-free and liquid. The anti-adhesion modulator is constituted by an epoxy polydimethylsiloxane which is not polymerized, but is polymerized by applying heat to the mold (during use of the stripping composition).

The proposed combinations of documents fail to render obvious the claims for at least two reasons:

I. The combination fails to teach the claimed features.

ECKBERG '453 utilizes a composition that requires 10-20% reactive diluents (solvents) to make a fluid solution, as the composition is essentially 100% solids. This is explained for example in Column 6, line 35-45 and 56-64, and column 7, lines 3-7. Accordingly, the composition is not a liquid as claimed. Moreover, the composition of ECKBERG '453 is polymerized by UV treatment, rather than polymerized heating as claimed (See the abstract). Furthermore, ECKBERG '453 fails to suggest that the composition may be used as a stripping composition.

Thus, as ECKBERG '453 fails to disclose or suggest the claimed properties of the stripping composition, e.g., a solvent-free, liquid solution, which is polymerized by heat, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have expected ECKBERG '453 to be usable as a stripping composition.

BRALEY was offered for teaching that methylpolysiloxanes may be used as release agents, but the claimed invention includes an anti-adhesion modulator that is constituted by an epoxy polydimethylsiloxane which is not polymerized. Moreover, BRALEY, similar to ECKBERG, requires an added solvent for fluidity as BRALEY requires "essential siloxanes" at least at 10% and the solvent for fluidity. See, e.g., column 2, lines 42-50. Thus, BRALEY fails to remedy the shortcomings of ECKBERG '453 for reference purposes.

ECKBERG '870 may teach heat curing release compositions, but ECKBERG '870 also fails to disclose or suggest utilizing a liquid composition as described by the claimed invention. Accordingly, ECKBERG '870 does remedy the shortcomings of ECKBERG '453 for reference purposes.

LOPES also fails to remedy the shortcomings of ECKBERG '453 for reference purposes, as LOPES requires that coatings for molds contain an organic solvent in order reduce the viscosity of the composition and facilitate the application of the composition to the shape-determining surface. See, e.g., column 4, lines 60-68.

DMITROFF teaches forming a composite fiberglass helicopter blade in a mold, but fails suggest the features absent from ECKBERG '453.

Thus, the combination fails to teach the claimed features.

II. The superior results of the claimed invention.

The advantage of the claimed features of the composition is that the composition is easily spread across the mold (i.e. is not tacky) prior to the application of heat (i.e., as discussed in paragraphs [0009] [0012], [0026] and [0031] of the published application). Additionally, the composition avoids the need to add a diluent or solvent to reduce viscosity for application to the mold a composition, where such solvents are

removed after application and dumped into the environment (See, e.g., paragraph [0003] and [0023]).

As discussed above, these advantageous (and superior) results attained by such features are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited documents.

A declaration by Dr. Patrick NOIREAUX, an expert in the field, has been provided in the appendix of the present amendment. Note that a signed copy was not available at the time of filing, but will follow shortly after the filing. Dr. NOIREAUX explains why the cited documents cannot teach, or even suggest, the claimed features, and why the claimed features result in superior properties compared to the prior art, and cited documents.

In particular, as pointed out by Dr. NOIREAUX, the composition of ECKBERG '453 and BRALEY would not have been considered "liquid" or "solvent-free". Accordingly, as further explained by Dr. NOIREAUX, the combination based on ECKBERG '453 and BRALEY fails to teach a composition that would provide superior properties of ease of application and suitable for use with heat curable composite, without the requiring the removal of a solvent.

Therefore, for at least the two reasons discussed above, the claimed invention is not rendered obvious by the combination of documents, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendment to the claims, the declaration and the foregoing remarks, this application is in condition for allowance at the time of the next Official Action. Allowance and passage to issue on that basis is respectfully requested.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future submissions, to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Robert A. Madsen/
Robert A. Madsen, Reg. No. 58,543
209 Madison Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

RAM/fb

APPENDIX:

The Appendix includes the following item(s):

- a 37 CFR 1.132 Declaration by Dr. Patrick NOIREAUX.